1 2	Matthew Campbell FEDERAL DEFENDERS OF EASTERN WASHINGTON AND IDAHO 10 North Post, Suite 700			
3	Spokane, Washington 99201 (509) 624-7606			
5	Attorneys for Defendant			
6 7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON (HONORABLE LONNY R SUKO)			
8	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)		
9	Plaintiff,)	CR-11-075-LRS	
10	vs.)	MOTION FOR EMERGENCY	
11	JOSEPH JEFFREY BRICE,)	HEARING RE: VIOLATION OF ATTORNEY-CLIENT AND/OR	
12 13	Defendant.) _) _)	WORK-PRODUCT PRIVILEGE AFFIDAVIT OF MATTHEW CAMPBELL	
14 15	Mr. Brice, through undersigned counsel, hereby moves for an emergency hearing regarding violation(s) of attorney-client and/or work-product privilege.			
16				
17	This motion is based upon the facts related in the attached Affidavit of Matthew			
18	Campbell. An emergency hearing is necessary because based on the facts recited in that Affidavit, it appears that the Government has violated attorney-client and/or work-product privileges, in violation of the Sixth Amendment. As discussed in the Affidavit, it appears that the Government seized materials from Mr. Brice's cell which included legal materials and documents protected from disclosure by			
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24	MOTION FOR EMERGENCY HEARING			

attorney-client and/or work product privilege.

It may be possible to mitigate the damage caused by those violations if a hearing is held immediately. Absent a hearing, irrevocable damage may be done.

An emergency hearing is necessary in order to prevent the further violation of attorney-client privilege. The Ninth Circuit has determined that potential violations of attorney-client privilege may be dealt with at the earliest opportunity, implicitly recognizing that certain bells cannot be unrung. *See, e.g., Bittaker v. Woodford,* 331 F.3d 715, 716-18 (9th Cir.2003) (*en banc*) (allowing an interlocutory appeal of a protective order that precluded the use of privileged materials outside the context of a habeas petition for ineffective assistance of counsel, which petition required the waiver of the attorney-client privilege as to all communications with the allegedly ineffective counsel).¹

The purposeful invasion of attorney-client and work product privileged materials can violate the Sixth Amendment by both communicating the defense strategy to the prosecution and tainting evidence. *See, e.g., United States v.*

Bittaker cites approvingly In re Ford Motor Co., 110 F.3d 954, 962-64 (3d Cir.1997) ("Appeal after final judgment cannot remedy the breach in confidentiality occasioned by erroneous disclosure of protected materials.... [T]he cat is already out of the bag.... [T]here is no way to unscramble the egg scrambled by the disclosure...."); In re Cont'l Ill. Sec. Litig., 732 F.2d 1302, 1307-08 (7th Cir.1984) ("Once the Report was released, any error in releasing it would be impossible to correct.")

Case 2:11-cr-00075-LRS ECF No. 265 filed 05/22/12 PageID.3052 Page 3 of 7

1	Matthew Campbell FEDERAL DEFENDERS OF EASTERN WASHINGTON AND IDAHO 10 North Post, Suite 700		
3	Spokane, Washington 99201 (509) 624-7606		
4	Attorneys for Defendant		
5 6	EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON		
7	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)		
8	Plaintiff,) CR-11-075-LRS		
9	vs.) AFFIDAVIT OF MATTHEW) CAMPBELL		
10	JOSEPH JEFFREY BRICE,		
11	Defendant.		
12	,		
13	I hereby declare under penalty of perjury, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746,		
14	that:		
15	1. I am counsel of record for Joseph Brice in this case.		
16	2. The following affidavit is based upon my own personal knowledge and		
17	my review of materials provided via discovery.		
18	3. On the morning of May 22, 2011, I received a phone call from Joseph		
19	Brice. Mr. Brice was then housed at the Spokane County Jail.		
20	4. Mr. Brice informed me that this morning, his cell was searched by		
21	United States Marshals as well as the FBI. Written materials were taken, including		
22	legal materials involved in this case.		
23	5. Mr. Brice also informed me that after the search, he was transferred to		
24			

- 6. I contacted the United States Marshals via email to find out what was going on. I received the following response:
 - I would defer any questions of what was seized or found to the us attorney smoot or fbi sa meewen. I can confirm that a cell search was conducted with the usms role as liaison and determining which materials were privileged legal or personal upon cursory inspection. The factors of found material and activity lead classification to 6E.
- 7. I then contacted AUSA Russ Smoot and asked why Mr. Brice's cell was tossed. Initially, he stated he would have to refer me back to the United States Marshals. I told him that I had already contacted the Marshals and that they had referred me to him.
- 8. I informed Mr. Smoot that I was concerned about the violation of attorney-client privilege. Mr. Smoot informed me that he could not provide me with the answers that I sought at this time. He stated that he wanted to be able to provide me with complete information, and thus needed to defer discussing the matter for at least a day.
- 9. I informed Mr. Smoot that I viewed this as a breach of attorney-client privilege. He stated that no privileged materials had been provided to him. I stated that to the best of my knowledge, no special master was used. He responded that he did not believe that the case agent, Agent Leland McEuen, had been given any privileged materials.
- 10. Mr. Smoot repeated that he wanted to be able to give me complete information, and needed a day or so. I stated that I did not think this matter could wait, as once privilege is violated, the bell cannot be unrung.

Case 2:11-cr-00075-LRS ECF No. 265 filed 05/22/12 PageID.3055 Page 6 of 7

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on March 6, 2012, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF System which will send notification of such filing to the following: Russell E. Smoot, Assistant United States Attorney.

s/ Matthew Campbell
WA 38696
Attorneys for BRICE
Federal Defenders of
Eastern Washington and Idaho
North Post, Suite 700
Spokane, Washington 99201
Telephone: (509) 624-7606

MOTION FOR EMERGENCY HEARING RE: VIOLATION OF PRIVILEGE